

- Serial No. 09/013,645

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please amend the claims as indicated below:

Please cancel Claim 7, without prejudice.

Please add Claim 8 as is indicated below:

D?
B1
Conc 48. The system of Claim 1, wherein said at least one video camera comprises a
plurality of video cameras.

REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, Claim 7 has been canceled, and Claim 8 (corresponding to former Claim 4) has been added. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Please note that Applicant's reference has changed from "PBAER 36769" to
--SEXTA 36769--.

The Examiner objected to the drawings as not showing the element "10" referred to in the specification as indicating a landscape camera system. A copy of Fig. 4 is enclosed for the Examiner's review, showing a proposed addition in red ink of the reference number--10-- for the

landscape camera system. Upon approval of the proposed correction to Fig. 4, Applicant proposes to submit formal corrected drawings.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected as obvious from Henderson et al. in view of Baker et al., the latter reference being cited as showing a plurality of personal control units. Claim 1 currently recites "a plurality of personal control units, each of said plurality of personal control units corresponding to respective ones of said plurality of video display modules and connected to said video camera control module for operating the video camera control module to independently select a desired field of view for each of said video display modules." The Examiner did not indicate any portion of Baker et al as disclosing or teaching a plurality of personal control units, and gave no basis for concluding that Baker et al. discloses or teaches a plurality of personal control units. The Examiner stated that "as such it is considered obvious that such personal control units for user selections are connected to the video camera control modules 80." The Examiner referred to column 12, lines 6-8 of Baker et al., relating to the valid source address flag within the transform processor engine, which "allows the user to construct abutting subimages in the (x,y) plane without danger of edge interference." It is respectfully submitted that this passage clearly appears to relate to the circumstance of a single user having a single personal control unit for assembling images, and teaches away from the circumstance of multiple users at multiple personal control units for controlling their own individual displays.

The Examiner further referred to Baker et al. at column 12, lines 28-41, which concerns image transformation, but does not teach, disclose or suggest a plurality of personal control

units. The Examiner further referred to Baker et al. at column 13, lines 8-31, which concerns production of multiple different outputs simultaneously from individual stored or currently converted images, and incorporation of several image processing subsystems within one overall system as shown in Fig. 8, which shows a single bus interface/control 76, and does not teach, disclose or suggest a plurality of personal control units. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's assumption that Baker et al. teaches a plurality of personal control units is not justified, and that the rejection of Claims 1 and 2 on the grounds of obviousness from Henderson et al. in view of Baker et al. should be withdrawn.

The interactive landscape camera system enables multiple passengers with in-seat audio/video on demand capability to electronically pan, tilt, and zoom the field of view of the landscape camera system camera independently of other passengers. It is respectfully submitted that Henderson et al. and Baker et al. do not disclose, teach or suggest, or teach any motivation for providing such a plurality of personal control units for operating the video camera control module and to independently select a desired field of view for each of the video display modules. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's conclusion that to do so would be obvious is based solely upon hindsight reconstruction of the invention based upon the disclosure of the present application. It is therefore further respectfully submitted on this basis that the rejection of Claims 1 and 2 on the grounds of obviousness from Henderson et al. in view of Baker et al. should be withdrawn.

Serial No. 09/013,645

Claim 3 was also rejected as obvious from Henderson et al. in view of Baker et al. as applied to Claims 1 and 2. It is thus respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claim 3 should be withdrawn, on the same grounds as noted above with regard to Claims 1 and 2.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in a condition for allowance, and an early favorable action in this regard is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP

James W. Paul
Registration No. 29,967

JWP/tah
Encls.: Return Postcard

HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Tele. No. (310) 824-5555
Facsimile No. (310) 824-9696